

YEARBOOK ON  
INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT  
LAW & POLICY  
2012–2013

YEARBOOK ON INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT LAW & POLICY

ANDREA K. BJORKLUND, EDITOR

*L. YVES FORTIER CHAIR IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LAW,  
MCGILL UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF LAW, MONTREAL*

*SENIOR FELLOW, VALE COLUMBIA CENTER ON SUSTAINABLE INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT  
(VCC), NEW YORK*

DANIEL LITWIN, MANAGING EDITOR

*ASSISTANT LEGAL COUNSEL, PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION, THE HAGUE*

*RESEARCH FELLOW, VCC*

ADVISORY BOARD

JOSÉ E. ALVAREZ  
*New York University School of Law, New York City*

RUDOLF DOLZER  
*University of Bonn*

EMMANUEL GAILLARD  
*Shearman & Sterling LLP, Paris*

GABRIELLE KAUFMANN-KOHLER  
*University of Geneva Law School*

ANDREAS F. LOWENFELD  
*New York University School of Law, New York City*

THEODORE H. MORAN  
*Georgetown School of Foreign Service, Washington, D.C.*

DANIEL M. PRICE  
*Rock Creek Global Advisors LLC, Washington, D.C.*

MANFRED SCHEKULIN  
*Austrian Federal Ministry of Economy,  
Family and Youth, Vienna*

STEPHEN M. SCHWEBEL  
*Independent Arbitrator and Counsel, Washington, D.C.*

DETLEV F. VAGTS  
*Harvard Law School, Cambridge*

LOUIS T. WELLS  
*Harvard Business School, Boston*

GEORGE A. BERMAN  
*Columbia Law School, New York City*

AHMED S. EL KOSHERI  
*Kosheri, Rashed and Riad, Cairo*

MICHAEL HWANG, SC  
*Barrister & Arbitrator, Singapore*

CAROLYN B. LAMM  
*White & Case LLP, Washington, D.C.*

PETROS C. MAVROIDIS  
*Columbia Law School, New York City*

JAN PAULSSON  
*Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, Paris*

W. MICHAEL REISMAN  
*Yale Law School, New Haven*

CHRISTOPH SCHREUER  
*Wolf Theiss, Vienna*

MUTHUCUMARASWAMY SORNARAJAH  
*National University Singapore Law School*

FRANCISCO ORREGO VICUÑA  
*Heidelberg Center, Santiago*

KARL P. SAUVANT, FOUNDING EDITOR OF THE YEARBOOK

*Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment, New York*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

LISE JOHNSON  
*VCC, New York*

UCHEORA ONWUAMAEGBU  
*Kuwait National Focal Point*

LISA E. SACHS  
*VCC, New York*

PETER MUCHLINSKI  
*School of Oriental and African Studies Law School, London*

FEDERICO ORTINO  
*King's College London School of Law*

ABBY COHEN SMUTNY  
*White & Case LLP, Washington, D.C.*

COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL EDITORIAL STAFF

HALEY ANDERSON

JEFFREY DERMAN JUNE HU

NICCOLÒ PIETRO CASTAGNO

PREETI BHAGNANI

JOSEPH KAY

JOHANNA RAE HUDGENS

MADISON CONDON

MELODY MCGOWIN

OLENA SAVYTSKA ENO USORO AMY WANG

## PEER REVIEWERS

The Editorial Committee of the *Investment Yearbook* thanks all those who helped in the preparation of this publication and especially the peer reviewers, who include:

Reuven Avi-Yonah  
Lorand Bartels  
Bertram Boie  
Jonathan Bonnitcha  
Anna Joubin-Bret  
Lee M. Caplan  
Aaron Cosbey  
Rudolf Dolzer  
Zachary Douglas  
Mike Gerrard  
Andrew Guzman  
Justin Jacinto

Josh Kallmer  
Mark Kantor  
Meg Kinnear  
Céline Lévesque  
Roberto Aguirre Luzi  
Kate Miles  
Timothy Nelson  
Luke Nottage  
Martins Paparinskis  
Joost Pauwelyn  
Miguel Perez  
Matthew Porterfield

Jeswald Salacuse  
Karl Sauvant  
Jeremy Sharpe  
Muthucumaraswamy  
Sornarajah  
Margrete Stevens  
Leon Trakman  
Anne van Aaken  
Samuel Wordsworth  
Katia Yannaca-Small

OUP USA

# VALE COLUMBIA CENTER ON SUSTAINABLE INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT

The Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment (VCC) is a leading applied research center and forum for the study, practice and discussion of sustainable international investment. The VCC focuses on analyzing important topical policy-oriented issues and constructing and implementing an investment framework that promotes sustainable development and the mutual trust needed for long-term investments that can be practically adopted by governments, companies and civil society. The Center undertakes its mission through interdisciplinary research, advisory projects, multistakeholder dialogue, educational programs, and the development of resources and tools. The Center's website is found at <http://www.vcc.columbia.edu>.



YEARBOOK ON  
INTERNATIONAL  
INVESTMENT  
LAW & POLICY  
2012–2013

EDITED BY  
*Andrea K. Bjorklund*

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

*Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide.*

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madrid  
Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece Guatemala Hungary  
Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore South Korea Switzerland Thailand  
Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by

Oxford University Press

198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

© Oxford University Press 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

ISBN 978-0-19-938632-1

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

#### **Note to Readers**

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is based upon sources believed to be accurate and reliable and is intended to be current as of the time it was written. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought. Also, to confirm that the information has not been affected or changed by recent developments, traditional legal research techniques should be used, including checking primary sources where appropriate.

*(Based on the Declaration of Principles jointly adopted by a Committee of the American Bar Association and a Committee of Publishers and Associations.)*

If you are interested in contributing content to be considered for future editions of the *Yearbook on International Investment Law & Policy*, please contact us at [laweditorial@oup.com](mailto:laweditorial@oup.com)

**You may order this or any other Oxford University Press publication by visiting the Oxford University Press website at [www.oup.com](http://www.oup.com)**

**If you would like to be placed on Standing Order status for *Yearbook on International Investment Law & Policy* whereby you will automatically receive and be billed for new annual volumes as they publish, please contact a Customer Service Representative.**

**In the United States, Canada, Mexico, Central and South America, contact:**

Customer Service

Oxford University Press USA

2001 Evans Road

Cary, NC 27513

Email: [custserv.us@oup.com](mailto:custserv.us@oup.com)

Phone (toll free in US): 1-866-445-8685

Phone (international customers): 1-919-677-0977

Fax: 1-919-677-1303

**In the United Kingdom, Europe, and Rest of World, contact:**

Customer Service

Oxford University Press

Saxon Way West, Corby

Northants, NN18 9ES

United Kingdom Email: [bookorders.uk@oup.com](mailto:bookorders.uk@oup.com)

Phone: +44 1536 741017

Fax: +44 1536 454518

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Submission Policy* xxvii

*Contributors* xxix

*Foreword by Karl P. Sauvant* xxxv

*Preface by the Editorial Committee* xxxix

## **PART ONE**

**1. Trends in FDI, Home Country Measures and Competitive Neutrality** 3

Karl P. Sauvant, Persephone Economou, Ksenia Gal, Shawn Lim, and  
Witold P. Wilinski

**2. International Investment Law and Arbitration: 2012 in Review** 109

Ian A. Laird, Borzu Sabahi, Frédéric G. Sourgens, Nicholas J. Birch,  
and Kabir Duggal

**3. International Investment Agreements, 2011–2012: A Review of Trends and New  
Approaches** 219

Lise Johnson and Lisa Sachs

## **PART TWO**

**SYMPOSIUM ON Sustainable Development and International Investment  
Law: Bridging the Divide** 263

**Symposium on International Investment Law and Sustainable Development** 265

Lise Johnson and Rahim Moloo

- 4. International Investment Law and Sustainable Development: Bridging the Unsustainable Divide** 273  
Rahim Moloo and Jenny J. Chao
- 5. Balancing Investment Protection and Sustainable Development in Investor-State Arbitration: The Role of Deference** 305  
Caroline Henckels
- 6. International Investment Law as International Development Law** 327  
Stephan W. Schill
- 7. Labor Provisions in International Investment Agreements: Prospects for Sustainable Development** 357  
Vid Prislán and Ruben Zandvliet
- 8. International Investment Law, Renewable Energy, and National Policy-making: On “Green” Discrimination, Double Regulatory Squeeze, and the Law of Exceptions** 415  
Mavluda Sattorova
- 9. Regulatory Expropriation Claims in International Investment Arbitration: A Bridge Too Far?** 451  
Alessandra Asteriti

### **PART THREE**

- General Articles**
- 10. International Law, Whether You Like It or Not: An Analysis of Arbitral Tribunal Practice Regarding the Applicable Law in Deciding State Contracts Disputes under the ICSID Convention in the Twenty-First Century** 477  
Patrick Dumberry and Jacob Stone
- 11. The Role of Municipal Laws in Investment Arbitration** 517  
Hernando Diaz-Candia
- 12. The Status of State-Controlled Entities under International Investment Agreements** 539  
Jo En Low
- 13. The United States and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)** 569  
David A. Gantz
- 14. The New 2012 U.S. Model BIT: Staying the Course** 595  
Paolo Di Rosa and Dawn Y. Yamane Hewett

**15. The Regulation of Foreign Direct Investment in Bolivia: Some Current Challenges** 609

Björn Arp

**PART FOUR**

**Special Section: Winning Memorials from the 2012 Foreign Direct Investment International Moot Competition (FDI MOOT)** 621

**16. Winning Claimant Memorial: Nalsar University of Law, Hyderabad** 623

**17. Winning Respondent Memorial: Saint-Petersburg State University** 659

OUP USA



# DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| <i>Submission Policy</i>                  | <i>xxvii</i> |
| <i>Contributors</i>                       | <i>xxix</i>  |
| <i>Foreword by Karl P. Sauvant</i>        | <i>xxxv</i>  |
| <i>Preface by the Editorial Committee</i> | <i>xxxix</i> |

## **PART ONE**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>1. Trends in FDI, Home Country Measures and Competitive Neutrality</b>      | <b>3</b> |
| A. Trends in Foreign Direct Investment and International Investment Agreements | 4        |
| B. Home Country Measures   | 6        |
| 1. Introduction  | 6        |
| a. Outward FDI Policies and the Impact of OFDI on Home Countries               | 6        |
| b. Definition and Types of Home Country Measures                               | 10       |
| c. Criteria for Eligibility  | 20       |
| d. Conditionality  | 24       |
| e. Approach  | 25       |
| 2. Institutional Framework and Information and Other Support Services          | 26       |
| a. Introduction  | 26       |
| b. Institutions  | 27       |
| c. Information and Other Support Services                                      | 33       |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| d. Criteria for Eligibility                                | 36 |
| i. Nationality   | 36 |
| ii. Sectors  | 37 |
| iii. Ownership   | 38 |
| iv. Firm Size  | 39 |
| v. Destination   | 40 |
| e. Conditionality  | 41 |
| f. Conclusions   | 42 |
| 3. Financial Measures                                      | 45 |
| a. Introduction  | 45 |
| b. Measures  | 46 |
| i. Grants  | 46 |
| (i) Feasibility Studies and Other Preinvestment activities | 46 |
| (ii) Costs of Setting Up Overseas Offices                  | 48 |
| (iii) Training and Human Capital Development               | 49 |
| ii. Loans  | 50 |
| (i) Concessional Loans                                     | 50 |
| (ii) Nonconcessional Loans                                 | 53 |
| (iii) Structured Finance                                   | 54 |
| (iv) Risk-sharing Arrangements                             | 55 |
| iii. Financial Guarantees                                  | 56 |
| iv. Equity Participation                                   | 57 |
| c. Criteria for Eligibility                                | 60 |
| i. Nationality   | 60 |
| ii. Sectors  | 61 |
| iii. Ownership   | 63 |
| iv. Firm Size  | 64 |
| v. Destination   | 66 |
| d. Conditionality  | 67 |
| e. Conclusions   | 68 |
| 4. Fiscal Measures   | 70 |
| a. Introduction  | 70 |
| b. Measures  | 71 |
| i. Exemptions from Corporate Income Tax on Certain Incomes | 71 |
| ii. Corporate Tax Rate Relief                              | 78 |
| iii. Tax Deferral  | 78 |
| iv. Tax Credits for Certain Categories of Expenditures     | 79 |
| v. Allowances for Qualifying Activities                    | 79 |
| c. Criteria of Eligibility and Conditionality              | 80 |
| i. Criteria of Eligibility                                 | 80 |
| ii. Conditionality   | 81 |



|  |            |
|--|------------|
| d. Conclusions   | 82         |
| C. Summary and Implications for Competitive Neutrality   | 83         |
| 1. Summary of Findings   | 83         |
| 2. Implications for competitive neutrality   | 89         |
| D. Annex Table I. Regulations Relating to Outward Investment in Selected Countries, as of 2011 | 96         |
| <b>2. International Investment Law and Arbitration: 2012 in Review</b>                         | <b>109</b> |
| A. Jurisdiction  | 110        |
| 1. Interpretation of Jurisdictional Undertakings   | 111        |
| 2. Effect of EU Membership on Energy Charter Treaty Claims                                     | 113        |
| 3. Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Materiae</i>  | 114        |
| a. The Existence of a Qualifying Investment  | 114        |
| i. Abuse of Process  | 114        |
| ii. Treaty Standards   | 117        |
| (1) Allegations of Illegality  | 117        |
| (2) Territorial Link   | 129        |
| (3) Subject-Matter Limitation of Investment Treaty   | 130        |
| iii. The ICSID Convention  | 131        |
| b. Disputes Arising under a BIT  | 136        |
| 4. Denial of Benefits  | 137        |
| 5. Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Temporis</i>  | 138        |
| 6. Jurisdiction by Means of MFN Clauses  | 140        |
| 7. The Use by Tribunals of Burdens of Proof in Jurisdictional Decisions                        | 145        |
| B. Merits  | 148        |
| 1. Fair and Equitable Treatment  | 152        |
| a. Legitimate Expectations   | 155        |
| b. Proportionality   | 158        |
| c. Denial of Justice   | 159        |
| 2. Discriminatory and Arbitrary Treatment  | 160        |
| 3. Full Protection and Security  | 161        |
| 4. Umbrella Clause   | 162        |
| 5. Expropriation   | 164        |
| 6. Performance Requirements  | 167        |
| 7. State-of-Necessity Defense  | 168        |
| C. Compensation and Nonpecuniary Remedies  | 169        |
| 1. General Principle of Reparation   | 170        |
| 2. Nonpecuniary Remedies   | 171        |
| 3. Compensation for Expropriation: Lawful vs. Unlawful Distinction                             | 172        |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4. Compensation for Violation of Nonexpropriation Protections in Investment Treaties  | 173 |
| 5. Transfer of the Remainder of Investment to the State                               | 175 |
| 6. Valuation Standards  | 175 |
| 7. Valuation Methods  | 176 |
| a. Discount Rate  | 182 |
| b. Date of Valuation and Post-Unlawful-Act Events                                     | 183 |
| 8. Moral Damages  | 184 |
| 9. Punitive Damages   | 185 |
| 10. Interest  | 186 |
| 11. Currency of the Award   | 188 |
| 12. Arbitration Costs and Legal Representation Costs                                  | 189 |
| 13. Limitations on Compensation   | 191 |
| a. Contributory Fault   | 191 |
| b. Consequential Damages: Causality and Provability                                   | 192 |
| c. Speculative, Uncertain or Hypothetical Damages                                     | 193 |
| D. Procedure  | 194 |
| 1. Burden/Standard of Proof   | 194 |
| 2. Interpretative Matters   | 195 |
| a. Customary International Law and Treaty Interpretation                              | 195 |
| b. No Rule Requiring the Harmonious Interpretation of Separate Treaties               | 196 |
| c. The Principle of Contemporaneity in Treaty Interpretation                          | 196 |
| 3. Nondisputing Party Participation: Filing <i>Amici</i> Briefs or Attending Hearings | 197 |
| 4. Challenges to Arbitrators  | 200 |
| 5. Provisional/Interim Measures   | 202 |
| a. Interim Measures Pending the Parties' Final Observations on Provisional Measures   | 202 |
| b. Domestic Action and Interim Measures   | 203 |
| 6. Third-Party Funding  | 204 |
| 7. Precedential Value of Earlier Decisions/ <i>Jurisprudence Constante</i>            | 205 |
| E. Annulment and Enforcement of Awards  | 206 |
| 1. Annulment Proceedings  | 206 |
| 2. Enforcement Proceedings  | 208 |

### 3. International Investment Agreements, 2011–2012: A Review of Trends and New Approaches 219

- Introduction 219
- A. An Inductive View of Selected Trends 222
  - 1. The State-Tribunal Balance of Power 222
  - 2. The Disappearing Umbrella Clause? 227
- B. Attention to Other Policy Considerations: Labor and Environmental Provisions 229
  - 1. Investment and Labor 229
  - 2. Investment and the Environment 234
- C. Investor-State Dispute Settlement and Transparency 237
- D. New Developments to Watch: Termination, Renewal and Renegotiation 242
  - 1. Governmental and Intergovernmental Policy Assessments: Developing New Approaches and Raising New Issues 244
  - 2. A New Template and Policy Recommendations for the Southern African Development Community 245
    - a. Standard Elements 245
    - b. New Provisions: Investor Obligations and Home-State Duties 249
- E. Developments in the European Union: Formulating the Various Pieces of EU Policy 251
- F. The 2012 U.S. Model BIT: New Trends in Transparency and Standard Setting and Possible Implications 255
- Concluding Remarks 260

## **PART TWO—SYMPOSIUM ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT LAW: BRIDGING THE DIVIDE**

### Symposium on International Investment Law and Sustainable Development 265

#### 4. International Investment Law and Sustainable Development: Bridging the Unsustainable Divide 273

- Introduction 273
- A. Sustainable Development in International Investment Law: Background and Trends 276
  - 1. Sources of Sustainability Norms: A Brief History 276

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 2. The Relevant Investment Treaty Standards and Sustainable Development  | 278        |
| 3. Sustainable Development Provisions in Recent Investment Treaties  | 281        |
| B. Available Mechanisms to Incorporate Sustainability Norms into Current Investment Treaty Practice                        | 286        |
| 1. Treaty Interpretation Mechanisms  | 287        |
| a. Background on Rules of Treaty Interpretation  | 287        |
| b. Context and Object and Purpose  | 289        |
| c. Evolutive Approaches to Interpretation  | 291        |
| d. Relevant Rules of International Law   | 293        |
| 2. Mechanisms Present in the Governing Law   | 295        |
| a. Legitimate Expectations   | 296        |
| b. Application of International Law  | 297        |
| c. The Requirement to Make an Investment in Accordance with the Law  | 300        |
| Conclusion   | 301        |
| <b>5. Balancing Investment Protection and Sustainable Development in Investor-State Arbitration: The Role of Deference</b> | <b>305</b> |
| Introduction   | 305        |
| A. The Standard of Review in Context   | 309        |
| 1. Overview  | 309        |
| 2. Standards of Review in the International Sphere   | 310        |
| 3. Deference and the Characteristics of Decision-makers  | 311        |
| B. Determining the Appropriate Standard of Review  | 313        |
| 1. A Multifactorial Approach   | 313        |
| 2. Regulatory Autonomy and Proximity   | 316        |
| a. Overview  | 316        |
| b. Comparative Perspectives  | 318        |
| c. International Investment Cases  | 320        |
| 3. Relative Institutional Competence and Expertise   | 322        |
| a. Overview  | 322        |
| b. Comparative Perspectives  | 323        |
| c. International Investment Cases  | 324        |
| Conclusion   | 325        |
| <b>6. International Investment Law as International Development Law</b>  | <b>327</b> |
| A. Tensions between Investment and Development   | 329        |
| B. Investment Regulation at the Domestic and International Level   | 332        |
| C. Historical Development of International Investment Law  | 334        |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| D. Development Discourse in Investment Arbitration  | 340        |
| E. The “Legitimacy Crisis” of Investment Law: Investment Protection as an Obstacle to Development?  | 345        |
| F. International Investment Law as International Development Law: The Example of Fair and Equitable Treatment   | 348        |
| Conclusion  | 353        |
| <b>7. Labor Provisions in International Investment Agreements: Prospects for Sustainable Development</b>  | <b>357</b> |
| Introduction  | 357        |
| A. Sustainable Development and International Labor Standards  | 359        |
| B. Normative Framework for Investment-Labor Linkage   | 362        |
| 1. Labor Rights Derogations   | 363        |
| a. The Race to the Bottom Fallacy   | 363        |
| b. Nonsystematic Regulatory Distortions   | 366        |
| 2. Policy Space Concerns  | 368        |
| 3. Balancing State Commitments with Investor Obligations  | 372        |
| 4. Normative Consequences and Regime Design   | 376        |
| C. Substantive Labor Obligations in International Investment Agreements   | 377        |
| 1. Preventing Labor Rights Derogations  | 378        |
| 2. Improving Labor Standards and Preserving Policy Space  | 383        |
| 3. Fostering Compliance by Foreign Investors  | 386        |
| 4. Innovation in Treaty Language – Prospects for Sustainable Development?   | 389        |
| D. Implementation, Enforcement and Dispute Settlement   | 390        |
| 1. Institutional Arrangements   | 390        |
| 2. Enforcement of Labor Provisions: What Role for Investment-Treaty Arbitration?  | 391        |
| a. Enforcement of Non-Derogation Obligations  | 392        |
| b. Challenges to Host State’s Regulatory Action in Labor Matters  | 396        |
| c. Ensuring Foreign Investors’ Compliance with Domestic Laws  | 403        |
| d. A Role for Workers?  | 407        |
| Conclusion  | 411        |
| <b>8. International Investment Law, Renewable Energy, and National Policy-making: On “Green” Discrimination, Double Regulatory Squeeze, and the Law of Exceptions</b> | <b>415</b> |
| Introduction  | 416        |
| A. Differentiating Renewables: National Policy Options and National Treatment Disciplines   | 419        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 1. Sustainability as a Basis of Differentiation: From “Foreign vs. Domestic” to “Green vs. Not Green”  | 419        |
| 2. The Interplay between Trade and Investment Regimes: A Double Regulatory Squeeze   | 424        |
| 3. Differentiation and Regulatory Purpose under International Investment Agreements: Between the Promise of Flexibility and the Restrictive Effect | 429        |
| 4. Environmental Impact and Sustainability: Process and Production Distinctions in Investment Treaty Law   | 430        |
| B. Sustainability: A Performance Requirement or an Overarching Treaty Objective?   | 434        |
| C. Creating a Space for Renewable Energy Policies: On Security of Exceptions Clauses, Energy Security, and the Perils of Fragmentation             | 436        |
| 1. Carve-out Clauses and Regulatory Flexibility  | 436        |
| 2. General Exceptions: The Promise of Derogations, Non-derogable Standards, and the Chilling Effect of Silent Treaties                             | 440        |
| 3. Security Exceptions: On Climate Change, Security of Supply, and the Perils of Fragmentation   | 445        |
| Conclusion   | 449        |
| <b>9. Regulatory Expropriation Claims in International Investment Arbitrations: A Bridge Too Far?</b>  | <b>451</b> |
| Introduction   | 451        |
| A. Regulatory Expropriation: A Summary   | 456        |
| B. The United States Supreme Court Approach to Regulatory Takings: Ad Hoc Balancing  | 461        |
| 1. The <i>Penn Central</i> Criteria in Investment Arbitrations   | 463        |
| C. The European Court of Human Rights and “Control of Use” in Article 1 Protocol 1: Proportionality and Margin of Appreciation                     | 465        |
| 1. Proportionality in Regulatory Expropriation Investment Claims   | 466        |
| D. Sustainable Development and Regulatory Expropriation: A Way Forward?  | 468        |
| Concluding Remarks   | 470        |

## PART THREE—GENERAL ARTICLES

### 10. International Law, Whether You Like It or Not: An Analysis of Arbitral Tribunal Practice Regarding the Applicable Law in Deciding State Contracts Disputes under the ICSID Convention in the Twenty-First Century 477

Introduction 477

A. The Applicable Law Clause in State Contracts 479

1. Different Options for Drafting an Applicable Law Clause 480

2. Brief Survey of Ad Hoc Tribunals' Interpretations of Applicable Law Clauses 484

B. The Law Applicable to State Contracts in Arbitration under the ICSID Convention 486

1. Article 42(1) of the ICSID Convention 486

2. When the Parties Have Chosen the Law Applicable to the State Contract 488

a. Past Practice of ICSID Tribunals 489

b. Recent Practice of ICSID Tribunals 491

i. Cases Where the Choice of Law Was Respected by Tribunals 491

ii. Cases in Which the Choice of Law Was Respected by Tribunals, But Their Reasoning Suggests That International Law Would Have Applied in the Event of Any Inconsistencies 496

iii. Analysis 500

c. Should International Law Control the Law Chosen by the Parties? 501

3. When the Parties Have Not Chosen the Law Applicable to the State Contract 505

a. Past Practice of ICSID Tribunals 506

b. Recent Practice of ICSID Tribunals 507

c. What Is the Scope of Application of International Law under the Second Sentence of Article 42(1)? 512

General Conclusion 515

### 11. The Role of Municipal Laws in Investment Arbitration 517

Introduction 517

A. BITs and Investment Protection Standards 518

B. The Relevance of Municipal Laws: Introduction to the Problem 524

C. The Paradox of Positivism in Arbitration 527

D. The Human Element in Arbitration and the Difference with Judges 530

- E. The Elusive Separation of Law and Facts 531
- F. The Standard of Review in Investment Arbitration 533
- G. Possible Conflicts of Municipal Laws with BITs and International Standards 534
- Conclusion: The Role of Municipal Laws in Investment Arbitration 535

## 12. The Status of State-Controlled Entities under International Investment Agreements 539

- Introduction 539
- A. The Data 541
  - 1. Research Methodology 541
  - 2. General Observations 542
- B. International Investment Agreements 543
  - 1. The State Contracting Party and Its Government as an Investor 543
  - 2. Governmental Ownership and Control 545
  - 3. Place of Incorporation, Registered Office or Seat 547
    - a. Established in Accordance with the Laws of a Contracting Party 547
    - b. Seat and Registered/Head Office in the Territory of a Contracting Party 547
  - 4. Authorized to Invest 550
  - 5. Pecuniary Gain 550
  - 6. Express Exclusion of SCEs 552
- C. The Meaning of “National” in the ICSID Convention 553
  - 1. A Contracting State 553
  - 2. State-Controlled Entities 555
    - a. Evolutive Interpretation 555
    - b. Ordinary Meaning of “National” with Respect to a Juridical Person 556
    - c. “National” in Context and in Light of the Object and Purpose of the ICSID Convention 557
    - d. “National” in Subsequent Practice 560
    - e. “National” in Supplementary Means of Interpretation and Preparatory Work 561
    - f. ICSID Tribunals 562
  - 3. The Autonomous Meaning of “National” 564
  - 4. *Effet Utile* and the Implications of Exclusion 566
    - a. Diminishing the Significance of ICSID 566
    - b. No Recourse to an International Method of Dispute Resolution 567
    - c. Vertical and Horizontal Uncertainty 567
- Conclusion 568



|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>13. The United States and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)</b>                  | <b>569</b> |
| Introduction  | 569        |
| A. The General Approach   | 571        |
| B. Potential Expansion of Membership  | 572        |
| 1. Canada and Mexico  | 573        |
| 2. Japan  | 574        |
| 3. Other Possible TPP Members   | 576        |
| C. Progress and Challenges  | 576        |
| 1. Investment   | 577        |
| 2. State-Owned Enterprises  | 579        |
| 3. Tobacco Products   | 580        |
| 4. Intellectual Property  | 580        |
| 5. Labor and Environment  | 581        |
| 6. Market Access  | 582        |
| a. Apparel and Footwear   | 582        |
| b. Automobiles and Auto Parts   | 583        |
| c. Agriculture  | 584        |
| d. To Renegotiate or Not to Renegotiate?  | 585        |
| 7. Regulatory Coherence and Supply Chain Support                                      | 586        |
| D. Domestic Political Factors in the United States                                    | 587        |
| 1. Political Support and Opposition   | 587        |
| 2. The Obama Administration's Catch-22  | 588        |
| E. Legal and Economic Challenges  | 589        |
| 1. The "Spaghetti Bowl"   | 589        |
| 2. Addressing Variations in Level of Economic Development                             | 590        |
| F. "Backdoor" Modification of NAFTA?  | 591        |
| Conclusion  | 592        |
| <b>14. The New 2012 U.S. Model BIT: Staying the Course</b>                            | <b>595</b> |
| A. Background   | 595        |
| B. Aspects of the 2012 Model BIT That Did <i>Not</i> Change from Its 2004 Predecessor | 597        |
| 1. Preamble and Definitions in Article 1  | 597        |
| 2. Scope and Coverage Provisions  | 598        |
| 3. Substantive Investment Law Protections   | 598        |
| 4. Dispute Resolution Clauses   | 599        |
| 5. Essential Security Clause  | 601        |
| 6. Annexes A, B and C   | 601        |
| C. Aspects of the Model BIT That <i>Did</i> Change                                    | 602        |
| 1. Regulatory Transparency Requirements   | 602        |
| 2. Scope of Environmental and Labor Obligations                                       | 602        |
| 3. Investments by State-Owned Enterprises and Investments in State-Led Economies      | 603        |

- 4. Financial Services Provisions 604
- 5. Definition of “Territory of a Party” 605
- D. Effect of the New Model BIT on Future BIT Negotiations 605
- Conclusion 607

#### 15. The Regulation of Foreign Direct Investment in Bolivia: Some Current Challenges 609

- Introduction 609
- A. Political Economy in Contemporary Bolivia 610
- B. The Constitution’s Preference for the “Collective Good” over Individual Property 611
- C. Natural Resources Are “Social Property of the Bolivian People” 612
- D. Preference for Bolivian Investment over Foreign Investment 613
- E. Prevalence of Bolivian Law over International Law 615
- Conclusion 618

### **PART FOUR—SPECIAL SECTION: WINNING MEMORIALS FROM THE 2012 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT INTERNATIONAL MOOT COMPETITION (FDI MOOT)**

#### 16. Winning Claimant Memorial: Nalsar University of Law, Hyderabad 623

- List of Authorities 624
- List of Legal Sources 626
- Statement of Facts 629
- Arguments Advanced 631
- I. The Tribunal was Improperly Constituted as the Initial Challenge to Prof. Alessandra Iracunda Should Have Been Successful 631
  - A. The Ad Hoc Committee Has the Jurisdiction to Determine the Challenge of Partiality against Prof. Alessandra Iracunda 631
    - 1. Article 52(1)(a) Can Be Invoked Due to Lack of Impartiality of the Tribunal 631
    - 2. Article 52(1)(d) Can Be Invoked in Cases of Lack of Impartiality of the Tribunal 632
  - B. Prof. Iracunda Did Not Exercise Independent and Impartial Judgment 633
    - 1. Prof. Alessandra Iracunda Prejudged the Subject Matter of the Present Dispute through Her Legal Writings 634
    - 2. Prof. Iracunda Had Morally Prejudged the Present Dispute 637

- II. The Tribunal Manifestly Exceeded Its Powers in Declining Jurisdiction 638
  - A. The Annulment Committee Has the Power to Annul the Award under Article 52(1)(B) of the ICSID Convention 638
  - B. The Transaction in Question Qualifies as an Investment under the ICSID Convention 639
    - 1. The Term “Investment” under the ICSID Convention Should Have Been Interpreted Broadly 639
    - 2. The Provisions Relating to Investment in the *Bela-Oscania BIT* Were Not Duly Appreciated 640
  - C. The Tribunal Committed a Grave Error in Relying Solely on the *Salini* Criteria to Determine the Existence of Investment 643
    - 1. The *Salini* Criteria Are Based on a Fundamentally Flawed Premise 643
    - 2. The *Salini* Criteria Are Merely Indicative of Existence of an Investment and Cannot Be Elevated to Jurisdictional Requirements 644
  - D. Contribution to Economic Development Is Not a Jurisdictional Criterion of an ICSID Investment 645
    - 1. Contribution to Economic Development Is an Intended Consequence of an ICSID Investment and Not Its Constitutive Element 645
    - 2. The Requirement of a “Significant” Contribution to Economic Development Unjustifiably Restricts the Notion of Investment 647
  - E. The Manner in Which the *Salini* Criteria Were Applied Was Flawed 648
- III. *Arguendo*, The Criterion of Contribution to Economic Development Was Satisfied 650
- IV. The Annulment Committee Has the Power to Determine the Meaning of Investment under the ICISD Convention 652
- V. The Tribunal’s Decision Not to Exclude Dr. Ranapuer’s Expert Report Constitutes A Serious Departure from A Fundamental Rule of Procedure 652
  - A. Cross-Examination and Independence of the Expert Are Fundamental Rules of Procedure 653
  - B. Reliance on the Expert Report without Providing an Opportunity for Cross-Examination Was a Serious Departure from a Fundamental Rule of Procedure 655
    - 1. Not Excluding the Expert Report Amounted to a Departure from a Fundamental Rule of Procedure 655

- 2. The Departure Is Serious as It Deprived the Applicant of an Intended Benefit and Would Have Led to a Substantially Different Award 657
- Request for Relief 658

**17. Winning Respondent Memorial: Saint-Petersburg State University 659**

- List of Authorities 660
- List of Legal Sources 665
- Statement of Facts 666
- Summary of Arguments 667
- Arguments 669
- I. Dr. Iracunda’s Participation in Arbitration Does Not Justify Annulment of the Award 669
  - A. Annulment under Article 52(1)(a) May Not Be Based on Alleged Lack of Independence 669
  - B. Applicant Cannot Invoke Article 52(1)(d) with Respect to Dr. Iracunda’s Participation in the Proceedings 670
  - C. Dr. Iracunda Was Independent 671
    - 1. Dr. Iracunda Was Independent 671
      - a. Academic Views of Dr. Iracunda 672
      - b. Dr. Iracunda’s Membership in Wilderness 673
      - c. Dr. Iracunda’s Conduct during the Course of Deliberations 674
      - d. Lack of Disclosure by Dr. Iracunda 675
    - 2. In Any Event There Is No “Manifest” Lack of Qualities Required by Article 14(1) 675
- II. The Tribunal Did Not Manifestly Exceed its Powers by Holding that Contribution to Development is Required 676
  - A. The Tribunal Properly Determined That It Lacked Jurisdiction 676
    - 1. The Asset Should Be an “Investment” under the ICSID Convention for the Tribunal to Have Jurisdiction 677
    - 2. Contribution to the Development of the Host State Is Required for an Asset to Be Considered an “Investment” under the ICSID Convention 678
      - a. The Ordinary Meaning of an “Investment” Cannot Be Established Solely on the Basis of Dictionaries’ Definition 678

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| b. The Meaning of “Investment” Should Be Established in Light of the Object and Purpose of the ICSID Convention      | 679 |
| c. The Contribution to the Development Criterion Derives from the Circumstances of the ICSID Convention’s Conclusion | 679 |
| B. Alternatively, the Excess of Powers Is Not Manifest   | 680 |
| 1. Failure to Exercise Jurisdiction Is Not Ipso Facto a Manifest Excess of Powers                                    | 680 |
| 2. The Alleged Excess of Power Is Not Manifest   | 681 |
| III. Tribunal’s Findings on Lack of Contribution to Development Do Not Justify Annulment of the Award                | 682 |
| A. Max Solutions’ Activities Did Not Contribute to the Development of Bela Rano Insularo                             | 682 |
| B. Alternatively, the Excess of Powers Is Not Manifest   | 683 |
| IV. The Ad Hoc Committee Is Not Empowered to Rule Conclusively on Whether the Applicant Made An Investment           | 683 |
| A. Article 52(4) Does Not Empower the Committee to Rule on Jurisdiction of the Centre                                | 684 |
| B. <i>Res Judicata</i> Effect of the Ad Hoc Committee’s Decision is Limited to Annulment of the Award                | 685 |
| C. If the Case Is Resubmitted the New Tribunal Would Decide <i>De Novo</i> on Jurisdiction                           | 685 |
| V. Admission of Dr. Ranapuer’s Report Does Not Justify Annulment of The Award  | 686 |
| A. Admission of Dr. Ranapuer’s Report without Cross-Examination Did Not Violate a Fundamental Rule of Procedure      | 686 |
| 1. The Tribunal Admitted Dr. Ranapuer’s Report in Accordance with Applicable Rules of Procedure                      | 686 |
| a. The Bela Rano Model Rules Were the Applicable Rules   | 686 |
| b. The Tribunal Properly Exercised Its Discretion to Admit Dr. Ranapuer’s Report                                     | 687 |
| 2. Admission of Untested Written Evidence Is Not a Violation of a Fundamental Rule of Procedure                      | 688 |
| B. Max Solutions’ Right to Be Heard Was Observed   | 689 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| C. In Any Event There Was No Serious Departure from a Rule of Procedure   | 690 |
| 1. Substantially the Same Award Would Have Been Rendered If Dr.Ranapuer’s Report Was Excluded                             | 690 |
| 2. Tribunal’s Decision Did Not Deprive Max Solutions of the Ultimate Benefits Provided by the Right to Confront an Expert | 691 |
| Prayer for Relief   | 691 |

OUP USA

# SUBMISSION POLICY

The *Investment Yearbook* is an annual publication published by Oxford University Press in association with the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment. It draws on the guidance of a distinguished Advisory Board, ongoing engagement by an Editorial Committee consisting of leading academics in the field of investment law and policy, and on skillful work by an Editorial Staff of students from Columbia Law School and McGill University Faculty of Law.

The *Investment Yearbook* addresses legal and policy issues in the area of international investment – from national, regional, and international perspectives. The Editorial Committee invites for publication manuscripts that are of outstanding quality in terms of academic rigor, quality of the argument, originality, and contribution to the field of international investment law and policy. The *Investment Yearbook* will not consider a manuscript that has been published previously. Every manuscript that is considered for publication will be assessed through an external double-blind peer-review process. The style of the manuscripts should be in accordance with the OSCOLA Guidelines, as adapted to the *Yearbook* (available from the Editorial Committee).

The Editorial Committee welcomes the submission of manuscripts to the *Investment Yearbook*. Manuscripts should be electronically sent to the Vale Columbia Center, the Editor, Prof. Andrea Bjorklund, or any member of the Editorial Committee.

Vale Columbia Center (VCC): [vcc@law.columbia.edu](mailto:vcc@law.columbia.edu)

Andrea K. Bjorklund, Editor of the *Investment Yearbook*

[andrea.bjorklund@mcgill.ca](mailto:andrea.bjorklund@mcgill.ca)

Editorial Committee:

Abby Cohen Smutny: [asmutny@whitecase.com](mailto:asmutny@whitecase.com)

Lise Johnson: [Ljj2107@columbia.edu](mailto:Ljj2107@columbia.edu)

Peter Muchlinski: [pm29@soas.ac.uk](mailto:pm29@soas.ac.uk)

Ucheora Onwuamaegbu: [ucheoral@gmail.com](mailto:ucheoral@gmail.com)

Federico Ortino: [federico.ortino@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:federico.ortino@kcl.ac.uk)

Lisa Sachs: [lsachsl@law.columbia.edu](mailto:lsachsl@law.columbia.edu)





## CONTRIBUTORS

**Björn Arp**, PhD in International Law from the University of Alcalá (2006). He has been Assistant Professor of Public International Law at the University of Alcalá (2000–2010); Secretary of the LLM Program in International Human Rights Protection (2004–2010); and Visiting Researcher at Harvard Law School (2007). He has been guest lecturer at several universities in Latin America and Spain. His publications focus on the international protection of human rights and of foreign direct investments. Currently, he is Adjunct Faculty at the American University Washington College of Law and Partner at the international legal and political services firm Aparicio, Arp & Associates in Washington, D.C.

**Alessandra Asteriti** has degrees from the University of Rome, Essex and Glasgow, where she obtained her PhD with a thesis in international investment law. She has worked as an archaeologist in Syria and taught Italian in the United States, before moving to the United Kingdom and completing her postgraduate education in law. She is currently an affiliate researcher at the University of Glasgow. She has numerous publications in the fields of international investment law and legal theory.

**Nicholas J. Birch** is an Associate at the Law Offices of Stewart and Stewart in Washington, D.C. and a JD/MBA graduate from Georgetown University. Mr. Birch has practiced in trade remedies and international investment law. He has also been involved in research and writing on international investment, arbitration, and trade law and development, which has been featured in multiple books and articles.

**Jenny J. Chao** has experience advising international financial institutions, government, and the private sector in energy, infrastructure, natural resources management, and sustainable development, with a particular emphasis on the emerging economies in East and Southeast Asia. Previous to her current role as an associate of an international law firm, Hogan Lovells, she was a research scholar with the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment. She holds a JD from Columbia Law School, a master's from Sciences-Po/Sorbonne, and a BS from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service.

**Hernando Diaz-Candia**, Science Doctor, Universidad Central de Venezuela; *Master in Legibus* (LLM), Fulbright Scholar, Harvard Law School; abogado, *cum laude*, Universidad Católica Andrés Bello. His doctoral thesis <<*El correcto funcionamiento expansivo del arbitraje*>> was awarded highest honors and published as a book in Spain (Aranzadi-Thomson Reuters) and Venezuela (Editorial Legis) in 2011. He is authorized to practice law in Venezuela and in the State of New York. He has served as domestic and international arbitrator, including before the International Chamber of Commerce, and currently teaches arbitration as part of the Science Doctorate curriculum at Universidad Central de Venezuela. He has represented investors (claimants) and sovereign states (respondents) before ICSID.

**Paolo Di Rosa** is a partner at Arnold & Porter LLP, where he heads the International Arbitration Practice Group. Previously, he was a senior lawyer at the U.S. Department of State, and chief negotiator for numerous U.S. international treaties. He has been ranked or listed as an international arbitration specialist in publications such as *Chambers Global*, *Chambers Latin America*, *Chambers USA*, *Legal 500*, *International Who's Who of Commercial Arbitration*, *SuperLawyers*, and *Best Lawyers in America*, among others. He received an AB *magna cum laude* from Harvard College in 1987, and a JD *cum laude* from Harvard Law School in 1991.

**Kabir Duggal** is an associate in the International Arbitration Group at Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt and Mosle LLP. He has been involved in arbitrations involving state and state-owned entities and is a graduate of the University of Mumbai, University of Oxford (Law Faculty) and the New York University School of Law.

**Patrick Dumberry**, PhD (Graduate Institute for International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland), is an Associate Professor at the University of Ottawa (Faculty of Law, Civil Law Section). He practiced international arbitration for several years with law firms (in Geneva and Montreal), as well as with Canada's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Trade Law Bureau). He publishes in the fields of international law and international investment law. His publications can be found at: [http://www.droitcivil.uottawa.ca/index.php?option=com\\_contact&task=view&contact\\_id=148&Itemid](http://www.droitcivil.uottawa.ca/index.php?option=com_contact&task=view&contact_id=148&Itemid).

**Persephone Economou** is a staff member of the World Bank's Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). Prior to that, she was the Managing Editor of the *Journal of International Business Studies*, where she co-edited a special issue on international business negotiations. Previously she was a staff member of UNCTAD in Geneva and of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations in New York. She was involved extensively in the *World Investment Report* series and was the Associate Editor of *Transnational Corporations*. Ms. Economou has been a consultant to various organizations, including the World Bank's Development Economics.

**Ksenia Gal** is a Research Associate at the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment; she holds an LLM degree in International Legal Studies from New York University Law School. Before that, she had received her first law degree from the Russian Academy of Justice in Moscow, Russia, and for several years worked at the Legal Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

**David A. Gantz**, AB (Harvard), JD, SJM (Stanford), is Samuel M. Fegtly Professor of Law and Director of the International Trade and Business Law Program at the University of Arizona,

James E. Rogers College of Law, where he teaches and writes in the areas of international trade and investment law, regional trade agreements, and international environmental law. He served earlier in the Office of the Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State, and practiced law in Washington, D.C. He is the author or co-author of four books and more than 50 law review articles and book chapters, and has served as a consultant for the UNDP, USAID and the World Bank, among others.

**Caroline Henckels** holds a PhD from the University of Cambridge, an LLM from the University of Melbourne and an LLB from Victoria University of Wellington. She is a Barrister and Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Victoria, Australia and of the High Court of New Zealand. She currently holds the position of Vice-Chancellor's Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of New South Wales, Australia. A monograph based on her PhD thesis, which concerns proportionality and standards of review in investor-state arbitration, will be published by Cambridge University Press in 2015.

**Dawn Yamane Hewett** is an associate in Arnold & Porter LLP's international arbitration, litigation, global anticorruption, and white collar practice groups. Ms. Hewett's practice includes the representation of sovereign states, corporate clients, and individuals in international arbitrations, U.S. litigation, and U.S. criminal investigations. Ms. Hewett obtained her JD from Yale Law School in 2008, Master's of Public Affairs from Princeton University in 2005, Master of Philosophy in Ethnic and Racial Studies (Sociology) from Trinity College Dublin in 2002, and undergraduate degrees in International Studies and Political Science from the University of Washington in 2000.

**Lise Johnson** is the Senior Legal Researcher on Investment Law and Policy at the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment (VCC), where she focuses on analyzing treaties and treaty-based investor-state arbitrations, and examining the implications those instruments and decisions have for host countries' domestic policies and development strategies. In addition, she concentrates on key institutional and procedural aspects of the legal framework government resolution of investor-state arbitration, including efforts to increase transparency in and legitimacy of investor-state dispute settlement. She has a BA from Yale University, JD from University of Arizona, LLM from Columbia Law School, and is admitted to the bar in California.

**Ian A. Laird** is a Partner in the International Dispute Resolution group of Crowell & Moring LLP, based in the firm's Washington, D.C. office. He has served as a Lecturer-in law at Columbia Law School and as an Adjunct Professor at the Georgetown University Law Center teaching subjects related to international investment law. He is Editor-in-Chief and Co-Founder of *Investmentclaims.com* (Oxford University Press), and Co-Director of the International Investment Law Center of the International Law Institute (ILI) in Washington, D.C. He has appeared as counsel in numerous investor-state arbitrations. For more information, see: <http://www.ianlaird.com>.

**Shawn Lim** is Managing Editor of the *Columbia FDI Perspectives* and Fellow at the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment. He is currently a JD candidate and Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar at Columbia Law School. He is also Articles Editor of the *Columbia*

*Journal of European Law* and holds an LLB with First Class Honours from the London School of Economics and Political Science.

**Jo En Low** is an associate at Clifford Chance LLP. She specializes in cross-border M&A in the energy, infrastructure and telecommunications sectors. Her research interests include foreign direct investment and international development. Ms. Low is a graduate of Columbia Law School and the University of New South Wales. She was formerly a research associate to the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment and the Harvard Kennedy School Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative. As a student, Ms. Low was a staff editor of the *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* and has published on subjects such as state-controlled entities, international investment, business and human rights.

**Rahim Moloo** (*at the time of writing*) was General Counsel at the University of Central Asia, an international treaty organization, and Senior Research Fellow at the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment. Since then, Mr. Moloo joined Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP as a Senior Associate in the International Arbitration Group. He has extensive experience in representing and advising multinationals, states and international organizations on matters of international law and in international disputes. In particular, Mr. Moloo focuses on representing parties in international investment disputes and international commercial arbitrations. Concurrently, Mr. Moloo is an adjunct professor at Columbia Law School, where he teaches a seminar on international commercial arbitration.

**Vid Prislan** is Research Fellow and PhD candidate at the Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies, Leiden University. He holds a diploma in international relations from the University of Ljubljana, and an LLB in Dutch law and LLM (*cum laude*) in public international law from Leiden University. In addition to conducting doctoral research on the interaction between domestic courts and investment tribunals, he regularly provides expert advice to governments and private parties in territorial and maritime delimitation disputes, and in the context of various investment arbitration proceedings. He is also Book-Review Editor of the *Leiden Journal of International Law*. Previously, he worked as research assistant at the Grotius Centre and supported counsel in contentious cases before the PCA and the ICJ.

**Borzu Sabahi** is an attorney in Curtis Mallet-Prevost Colt & Mosle LLP. He represents states and state-owned entities in complex commercial and investment treaty arbitrations under the rules of ICC, ICSID, LCIA, and UNCITRAL involving industries such as oil and gas, mining, construction, and telecommunications. He is an adjunct professor at Georgetown and Columbia Law Schools where he co-teaches seminars on investor-state arbitration and on international oil and gas development. He is co-director of the International Investment Law Center at the ILI and an editor of Oxford's Investment Claims website. He has widely published on international investment law and arbitration and regularly speaks at professional conferences on these topics.

**Lisa Sachs** is the Director of the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment. At the VCC, she has overseen the development of robust research portfolios and advisory work on sustainable investment in natural resources (oil, gas, mining, and land) and international investment law and policy. Her academic work has included research on extractive industries, trends in foreign investment, corporate responsibility, human rights, and integrated economic development. She is a member of the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network thematic group on the Good Governance of Extractive and Land Resources. She received a BA

from Harvard University and a JD and a Master of International Affairs from Columbia University, where she was a James Kent Scholar and recipient of the Parker School Certificate in International and Comparative Law.

**Mavluda Sattorova** is a lecturer at the University of Liverpool School of Law where she teaches courses in international investment law, international energy law and law of the WTO. Prior to obtaining her PhD and LLM degrees from the University of Birmingham, she completed a PhD in civil law (Tashkent State Institute of Law) and taught at the National University of Uzbekistan. She was admitted to the Uzbek Bar in 1999 and was involved in drafting and negotiating investment contracts and representing clients before the Supreme Economic Court of Uzbekistan.

**Karl P. Sauvant** is Resident Senior Fellow at of the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment (VCC—a joint center of Columbia Law School and The Earth Institute at Columbia University), Senior Research Scholar and Lecturer in Law at Columbia Law School and Guest Professor at Nankai University, China. Before that, he was the Founding Executive Director of the VCC and Director of UNCTAD’s Investment Division. He is a Fellow of the Academy of International Business and an Honorary Fellow of the European International Business Academy. He received his PhD from the University of Pennsylvania in 1975.

**Stephan Schill** (Dr. iur. (Frankfurt), LLM. (NYU), LLM. (Augsburg)) is Senior Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg, Principal Investigator of the ERC-project on “Transnational Public-Private Arbitration as Global Regulatory Governance,” and Lecturer at the Frankfurt University and in the joint LLM program of Heidelberg University and the Universidad de Chile. He is admitted to the bar in Germany and New York and has acted as counsel before the European Court of Human Rights. He is also the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of World Investment and Trade.

**Jacob Stone** LLB (civil law, Université Laval), JD (common law, magna cum laude, University of Ottawa), is a lawyer at McCarthy Tétrault LLP in Québec City, Canada. A member of the firm’s Business, Mining and International Trade and Investment Law Groups, his practice focuses on corporate and project financing, securities, mergers and acquisitions and venture capital in the mining, energy and biotechnology sectors as well as investment treaty and foreign corruption issues. The views expressed herein are his own and do not necessarily reflect the views, positions, or opinions of McCarthy Tétrault LLP on such matters. Before joining McCarthy Tétrault LLP, Mr. Stone worked in international arbitration in the investment and services section of the Trade Law Division of the federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development in Ottawa, Canada.

**Witold P. Wilinski** is Assistant Professor at the Warsaw School of Economics (World Economy Faculty) where his work focuses primarily on international investment and emerging market multinational enterprises. He was a Visiting Researcher at the Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment at Columbia University. He received his PhD from the Warsaw School of Economics and a Post-Master Diploma from University Paris Dauphine.

**Ruben Zandvliet** is a PhD candidate at the Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies, Leiden University. His research focuses on labor standards in international economic law. He

holds an LLM (*cum laude*) from Leiden University and an LLM (*James Kent Scholar*) from Columbia University. In addition to his doctoral studies, he is a visiting researcher at The Hague Institute for Global Justice. Previously, he worked as a policy adviser for a Member of Parliament in the Netherlands in the field of economic policy, corporate law, and constitutional law.

12 June 2013  
Investment Yearbook 2012–2013

OUP USA



## FOREWORD

The international investment law and policy regime has developed rapidly over the past four decades and, in the process, undergone considerable changes. As Jeswald W. Salacuse and Nicholas P. Sullivan observed when writing about the regime as it existed in the mid-1970s: “foreign investors who sought the protection of international investment law encountered an ephemeral structure consisting largely of scattered treaty provisions, a few questionable customs, and contested general principles of law.”<sup>1</sup> Today, the investment regime is stronger than it has ever been in terms of protecting foreign investors. In fact, the investor-state dispute-settlement mechanism arguably makes it stronger than the international trade regime.

Partly because of this rapid development of the investment regime, it is far from perfect. As Brigitte Stern suggested several years ago, the regime was undergoing a “*crise de croissance*, a teenager’s crisis,” although she updated her observation in 2013 to say that “the teenager is now in his twenties and should become more reasonable. In fact, in my view, he does.”<sup>2</sup> Certainly, more countries are strengthening the regime by entering into new international investment agreements and accepting its functioning, thus firming it up, than are leaving the regime or seriously questioning key aspects of it (including its dispute-settlement mechanism), thus diminishing its legitimacy.

This state of affairs is not surprising: Like any regime, the international investment regime is in constant evolution. All stakeholders and others who have an interest in the investment regime – governments, business, trade unions, local communities, nongovernmental organizations, practitioners, academics – contribute to this evolution in one way or another, either by changing the regime’s substantive and procedural provisions or by advocating various changes – some small, some big. Some of the proposed changes would strengthen the protection of foreign investors and investments, some seek greater liberalization, some aim for a new balance between the rights and obligations of governments and investors, some want to emphasize the right to

1. Jeswald W. Salacuse and Nicholas P. Sullivan, “Do BITs Really Work? An Evaluation of Bilateral Investment Treaties and Their Grand Bargain,” 46(1) *Harvard International Law Journal* 67 (2005), p. 68.

2. “An interview with the Honorable Charles N. Brower and Professor Brigitte Stern,” *Arbitration Trends*, Winter 2013, p.13.

regulate, and some seek a reorientation of the purpose of the regime. Other proposed changes relate to procedural matters and, especially, the dispute-settlement mechanism. However, virtually all proposed changes reflect the recognition that international investment needs a strong rule of law; debated is what, precisely, that rule of law should encompass and how it should be implemented, in the interest of strengthening the legitimacy of the international investment regime and in light of changing circumstances and new realities.

Among the new realities, none is more important than the growing number of emerging markets (all non-OECD countries) that are becoming significant outward investors. During the period 2007–2011, at least 129 emerging markets reported outward foreign-direct-investment transactions; outflows from these economies reached US\$ 460 billion in 2011 – some nine times world outflows during the first half of the 1980s.<sup>3</sup> Emerging markets have become important participants in the world foreign-direct-investment market. This gives especially the most important among them (including the BRICs) a different stake in the international investment law and policy regime. It is a stake that is no longer almost exclusively defined by their position as capital-importing *host* countries, but increasingly also as capital-exporting *home* countries, interested in protecting their investments abroad and facilitating the operations of their investors. Conversely, the traditional home countries, the developed countries, are increasingly “discovering” that they are also important host countries, interested in maintaining their own policy space to pursue legitimate public policy objectives. Moreover, governments in both groups of countries have become respondents in a growing number of investment disputes; and the potential for such disputes is very high, considering that there are more than 100,000 multinational enterprises that control over one million foreign affiliates, in a world in which the great majority of countries are bound by international investment agreements that typically include investor-state dispute-settlement provisions.

This fundamental shift in the interest situation of a growing number of countries toward mixed interests as home and host countries may lead to a narrowing of differences (and perhaps even a convergence of interests) between the traditional host and home countries that, eventually, may allow a multilateral investment regime to emerge. But we are certainly still quite far from such a regime. At the same time, though, the series of bilateral and regional investment negotiations among major countries that are underway could potentially further narrow the differences in various approaches, yielding perhaps a template that could become the guidepost for future common efforts.

In this rapidly evolving setting, myriad issues emerge that require the attention of scholars, practitioners, investment negotiators, business executives, trade-union officials, members of nongovernmental organizations, and other interested parties. This edition of the *Investment Yearbook* offers, as in the past, a platform for the examination of the various aspects of the international investment problématique, with a view toward reaching a better understanding of the subject matter. All of the authors who contributed to it have taken full advantage of this opportunity. Particularly noteworthy is that the present edition pays special attention, in the context of its Symposium, to issues relating to sustainable international investment. This is important and timely, as the ongoing discussions about improving the international investment law and policy regime need to include, if not to start from, a review of the purpose(s) that the regime is meant to serve. Everything else – including its substantive content and its procedural mechanisms – flows from the purpose(s) of the regime.

3. UNCTAD, *World Investment Report 2012* (Geneva: UNCTAD, 2012).



I congratulate the new Editor of the *Investment Yearbook* and the members of its Editorial Committee for this edition of the *Investment Yearbook* and wish them every success for future editions.

Karl P. Sauvant, PhD  
Founding Editor of the *Investment Yearbook*  
Resident Senior Fellow  
Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment

OUP USA



# PREFACE

Investment law continues to grow at an extraordinary pace and to attract attention and criticism from its proponents and its opponents, and from those who lie somewhere in between. The 2012–2013 *Yearbook* reflects the wide-ranging nature of investment law and its inviolable links with policy, with topics that include questions about applicable law and the interplay between multiple potentially applicable laws, the challenges inherent in negotiating a regional trade agreement among states with divergent levels of economic development, the effect of states' policies to encourage *outward* foreign direct investment that distorts the competitive relationship among investors, and the effect that sustainable development concerns have, and ought to have, on international investment law. Given this breadth, it is challenging to identify unifying themes. Yet there are some observations that draw together the eclectic and rich contributions to this edition of the *Yearbook*.

First, the range of people interested in investment law is remarkable. The authors in the *Yearbook* range from seasoned practitioners to junior academics, from policy experts to crack-jack lawyers, and from public international law specialists to private international law mavens. Investment law attracts people with divergent international interests and areas of expertise and provides them with a large forum in which to interact.

Second, notwithstanding concerns about the fragmentation of international law, investment law is arguably a counterexample to the fragmentation dynamic. While investment lawyers are specialized, and investment case law continues to grow and can be self-referential, investment law does look outside itself for guidance and influence. Topics such as the intersection of investment law and sustainable development law, covered in the *Yearbook's* virtual symposium, the intersection of investment law with municipal laws and the intersection of domestic contract law with international law, covered in two of the *Yearbook's* chapters, show the vibrance of investment law and the potential for it to be influenced by other legal regimes, instead of operating in splendid isolation.

Third, the appropriate role of state-owned or state-controlled enterprises (SCEs) is central in one contribution, and subsidiary in at least two others. This includes questions about whether SCEs can be claimants as well as whether they can be respondents in investor-state arbitration cases – inverse questions that demonstrate the reach and complexity of the investor-state dispute settlement regime – as well as concerns about the influence that states may exert over

the investment decisions of SCEs and the concomitant effect of those decisions on competitive neutrality.

Fourth, notwithstanding concerns about investment agreements generally and investor-state dispute settlement in particular, and notwithstanding some diminution in the number of investment agreements signed every year, many states continue to pursue an energetic negotiating agenda. The United States is one of the more active, and the Trans-Pacific Partnership, if achieved, will likely point the way to what we might expect from the even more ambitious Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) – the proposed agreement between the European Union and the United States. The release of a new U.S. Model BIT in 2012, while disappointing to many (including both those who sought stronger protections for business and those who sought greater regulatory autonomy for host states) can be viewed as an endorsement of the status quo, though with some slight changes likely to be of importance particularly in negotiations with China and India.

The *Yearbook* of 2012–2013 starts with its customary survey of the “state of the world” in three areas of international investment law: trends in foreign direct investment; notable events in arbitration jurisprudence; and the ways that states are reforming international investment agreements as they react to developments in cases and practice. Taken together, these three pieces provide a comprehensive review of the state of international investment law and policy underpinned by expert analysis and commentary.

Investment commentary sometimes focuses more on law than on policy. Yet the *raison d'être* of international investment agreements is to promote foreign investment (not just to provide protection to those investments). Thus, the first piece in the *Yearbook*, written by Karl P. Sauvant, Persephone Economou, Ksenia Gal, Shawn Lim, and Witold P. Wilinski, begins by describing and assessing trends in foreign direct investment in 2012. Foreign direct investment decreased in 2012, after a modest increase in 2011. It then turns to an understudied but increasing area of concern in investment policy – home country measures (HCMs), which influence and often direct investment flows to certain destinations. These measures have an effect on “competitive neutrality” by affecting companies’ decisions about where to invest and even about whether to invest; some measures effectively subsidize outward foreign direct investment so long as it is directed in particular ways. The authors provide a detailed survey of HCMs in the top ten developed countries and the top ten emerging markets (as measured by UNCTAD) and thoughtful, cogent analysis of the potential effects of those measures on investment decisions and the policies that home countries seek to effectuate with the establishment of measures that encourage and direct investment.

Dispute settlement is a key feature of investment law, and the second piece, written by Ian A. Laird, Borzu Sabahi, Frédéric G. Sourgens, Nicholas J. Birch, and Kabir Duggal, is a comprehensive, insightful assessment of 2012’s investment jurisprudence. It covers the jurisdictional issues ever present in international investment law, including the effect of EU membership on Energy Charter claims, the requirement that an investor have made an “investment” and associated difficulties therein, and MFN clauses. The authors include description and analysis of tribunals’ treatment of burden of proof. As for merits issues, the authors cover several umbrella clause cases, along with claims of violations of fair and equitable treatment and expropriation without payment of compensation and one case involving performance requirements. The chapter also addresses matters such as the principle of judicial economy, the overlap and conflation of various obligations, and evidentiary burdens regarding the establishment of liability. The final section covers compensation and nonpecuniary awards, with in-depth analysis of the valuation methods employed by tribunals in multiple contexts.

One of the most important sources of states' current views on investment policy, on the laws that facilitate investment, and on dispute settlement is their current investment agreements. The third chapter in Part One surveys the investment agreements signed by states in 2011 and 2012. The authors, Lise Johnson and Lisa Sachs, discern several trends of interest to the investment law community: developments in the balance of power between states and tribunals; fewer inclusions of "umbrella clauses" in treaties; greater attention to the interaction between investment law and labor and environmental concerns; a growing number of countries including transparency provisions in their treaties (although the majority of agreements still do not include transparency provisions); and issues surrounding termination, renewal, and renegotiation of treaties as many agreements near the end of their initial life-span, often a period of ten years. The authors conclude by bringing their expertise to bear by providing in-depth analysis of three important agreements in the investment realm: the Southern African Development Community's proposed Model Investment Agreement for use by its members (which, *inter alia*, recommends against the inclusion of a fair and equitable treatment obligation and investor-state dispute settlement), the European Union's proposals regarding investment policy, and the United States' 2012 Model BIT (which is covered in less detail given the chapter devoted to it later in the volume).

Part Two of the *Yearbook* commences with a symposium, expertly directed by Lise Johnson and Rahim Moloo, on the intersection between sustainable development and international investment law. An impressive and wide-ranging array of chapters includes one by Rahim Moloo and Jenny J. Chao, discussing strategies for ensuring that sustainable development principles inform and guide the application and development of investment law and a contribution by Caroline Henckels on the role that deferential standards of review play in that regard. Stephan W. Schill discusses in his chapter the importance of treating international investment law as part of the international law of development rather than as antagonistic towards it. Vis Preslan and Ruben Zandvliet offer their perspective on the prospects for incorporation norms of corporate social responsibility in international investment agreements. Mavluda Sattorova discusses the intersection of international investment law and renewable energy, with a comparative analysis of EU law and international trade law to illustrate that existing investment law may leave too little space for national policy initiatives regarding green energy. Finally, Alessandra Asteriti addresses the perennially fertile topic of regulatory expropriation.

The chapters in Part Three illustrate the eclectic and broad reach of international investment law. Two chapters address different facets of the ever-present and ever-difficult issue of applicable law. The first of these, by Patrick Dumberry and Jacob Stone, analyzes tribunal practice in choosing the law applicable to state contracts in arbitrations convened under the ICSID Convention. In addition to providing a thorough assessment of tribunal practice with respect to contractual claims, as opposed to BIT claims, the chapter engages with the important policy question of what role, if any, international law should play when state contracts are governed by municipal law, usually that of the host state. They conclude that international law is not limited to playing a corrective or complementarity function, even when a contract contains an explicit choice-of-law clause, but that at the very least the customary international law principle of minimum standard of treatment should be held to apply in all cases. The second chapter on applicable law, by Hernando Diaz-Candia, addresses what might be described as the inverse question: What role should municipal law play in an international investment arbitration and, in particular, what role does municipal law play in establishing whether there has been a breach of an investment treaty obligation or of customary international law? He suggests that tribunals should take a deferential view when states are consistently applying municipal laws of general applicability, but that deference should be *less* in the case of individualized decisions; in any

event, the burden should rest on the investor to prove a breach of international law, with a presumption of the lawfulness of state activity.

In the next chapter Jo En Low offers an empirical assessment of the ways that investment agreements treat state-controlled entities (SCEs). For this novel and thorough chapter she reviewed 851 treaties in the course of her research, which represented treaties covering 70 percent of foreign direct investment outflows for the period 2005–2010. Ms. Low concludes that while some treaties (particularly those concluded by the United States, by Japan after 2002, and by many Middle Eastern states) explicitly include state-controlled entities in their definition of investor, most do not explicitly address whether SCEs may qualify as investors (and thus as claimants) under the treaty. Yet the definition of investor in most treaties is broad enough to allow SCEs to qualify, subject to its meeting all necessary requirements, which Ms. Low carefully and clearly details. In a few rare treaties SCEs are explicitly excluded. Ms. Low then addresses whether an SCE might have difficulty commencing an ICSID Convention–based arbitration if the SCE is treated as the *state* itself, rather than as a *national* of the state, but concludes that such an outcome is neither desirable nor mandated by the negotiating history of the ICSID Convention or by the evolution of the meaning of “national” in international law.

The *Yearbook* then turns to chapters analyzing two investment agreements of likely historical importance. David A. Gantz offers his assessment of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), a proposed multilateral free trade agreement whose current members just completed (in August 2013) their 19th round of negotiations. Professor Gantz particularly analyzes the TPP as a key part of the United States’ political, military, and economic strategy in Asia. The TPP is currently projected to include a chapter on investment and resolution of disputes through investor-state dispute settlement (although Australia’s previous government, under Prime Minister Julia Gillard, announced that Australia would no longer sign agreements that provide for investor-state arbitration; it is not clear whether the current government will continue that policy or whether Australia would be able to impose that policy on the other member states), and Professor Gantz’s analysis covers those issues as well as other potentially difficult issues such as the treatment and responsibilities of state-owned enterprises, the treatment of tobacco products, the scope of intellectual property protections, the position of labor and environmental protections, market-access issues, and required transparency of regulatory measures. He assesses the hurdles that must be overcome before the TPP negotiations can be concluded.

The year 2012 saw the belated issuance of a new U.S. Model BIT. Paolo Di Rosa and Dawn Y. Yamane Hewett, noting first that the 2012 Model BIT is a bit anticlimactic given that it did not depart significantly from its predecessor, provide an overview of what did and did not change in the new model. As to the former, the new BIT proposes more significant obligations regarding regulatory transparency, expands obligations to protect labor and the environment, ensures that SOEs are subject to the same standards as states themselves when they are acting under delegated governmental authority, contains revisions to financial services regulations, and clarifies that the definition of “territory of a Party” includes the territorial sea. Mr. Di Rosa and Ms. Hewett then analyze the likely effects of these changes on future BIT negotiations with such likely treaty partners as China, India, and Russia, among others.

The final chapter is a contribution by Björn Arp on the regulation of foreign direct investment in Bolivia. This short case study outlines the state of affairs in Bolivia after its renunciation of the ICSID Convention in 2007 and the renunciation of several of its BITs. Bolivia also adopted a new constitution in 2009, which provides, inter alia, that domestic law has precedence over international law. Bolivia has also given notice of termination of several of its BITs. It is thus in the vanguard of the backlash against international investment law and arbitration and its assertion of the primacy of state control over natural resources does not permit foreign investors to



have much negotiating leverage. Mr. Arp's case study describes a "natural resources naturalism" that allows room for arbitrary governmental decision-making and corruption.

The volume closes with the customary inclusion of the best memorials submitted by contestants in the FDI Moot Competition. The winning memorial for claimants was submitted this year by students from the Nalsar University of Law in Hyderabad, India, and the winning memorial for respondents was written by students from Saint Petersburg State University in Russia. The FDI Moot's popularity, and the number of students participating, has been growing every year. These memorials won amidst stiff competition and signal the breadth and the depth of those devoting their attention to investment law.

Andrea K. Bjorklund

*L. Yves Fortier Chair in International Arbitration  
and International Commercial Law  
McGill University Faculty of Law*

Lise Johnson

*Senior Legal Researcher: Investment Law and Policy  
Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment*

Peter Muchlinski

*Professor of International Commercial Law,  
The School of Law, The School of Oriental  
and African Studies, University of London*

Ucheora Onwuamaegbu

*Legal Adviser, Kuwait National Focal Point*

Federico Ortino

*Reader in International Economic Law  
School of Law  
King's College London*

Lisa Sachs

*Director  
Vale Columbia Center on Sustainable International Investment*

Abby Cohen Smutny

*Partner, White & Case LLP, Washington, D.C.*